Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **000**, 1–6 (2004) Printed 2 February 2008 (MN LaTeX style file v2.2)

arXiv:astro-ph/0401278v1 15 Jan 2004

Variation of the fine structure constant in QSO spectra from coherent dark matter oscillations

M. G. Barnett, R. Dick and K. E. Wunderle

Department of Physics and Engineering Physics, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada SK S7N 5E2

Accepted —. Received —; in original form —

ABSTRACT

We consider the problem of the evolution of the fine structure coefficient α under the assumption that the scalar field coupling to the Maxwell term satisfies the condition $mt \gg 1$ for coherent dark matter oscillations.

In this case we find that the coupling scale f in the leading order coupling $-(\phi/4f)F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ affects the cosmological evolution of α according to $\ln(\alpha/\alpha_0) \propto \xi(m_{Pl}/f) \times \ln(\tanh(t/2\tau)/\tanh(t_0/2\tau))$. A fit to the QSO observations by Murphy et al. yields $f = \xi \times 2.12^{+0.58}_{-0.37} \times 10^5 m_{Pl}$. Here $m_{Pl} = (8\pi G_N)^{-1/2}$ is the reduced Planck mass, and $\xi^2 = \varrho_\phi/\varrho_m$ parametrizes the contribution of ϕ to the matter density in the universe.

Key words: atomic data – cosmology: theory – dark matter.

1 INTRODUCTION

The question whether the value of Sommerfeld's fine structure constant should actually be determined through the dynamics of a scalar field had been addressed already by Fierz (1956) and Jordan (1959), whose investigations were partly motivated by Kaluza–Klein theory and by Dirac's proposal of a variability of constants over cosmological time scales. Nowadays it is well known that dynamical gauge couplings are predicted by string theory, and the relevant coupling e.g. of the heterotic string dilaton to gauge fields in four dimensions is of gravitational strength $f^{-1} = (16\pi G_N)^{1/2} = \sqrt{2}m_{Pl}^{-1}$ (Dick 1997c). In an independent development Bekenstein (1982) had introduced a class of models for dynamical α where the evolution of the fine structure constant is driven through couplings to energy densities.

Therefore there was always theoretical interest in dynamical models for α, but in recent years Webb et al. also reported evidence for a variation of the fine structure coefficient over cosmological time scales (Webb et al. 1999; Murphy et al. 2001; Webb et al. 2001; Murphy, Webb & Flambaum 2003). The analysis of 128 quasar absorption systems by Murphy, Webb & Flambaum (2003) found an average increase[1]

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} \equiv \frac{\alpha_z}{\alpha} - 1 = -(0.543 \pm 0.116) \times 10^{-5}, \tag{1}$$

since redshift $z = 1.67$, i.e. over the last ≈ 9.6 billion years. Here α_z is the fine structure coefficient at redshift z and $\alpha \equiv \alpha_0 \equiv \alpha(t_0)$. In Murphy et al. (2003) results are reported for 143 quasar apsorption lines, yielding $\Delta\alpha/\alpha = -(0.57 \pm 0.11) \times 10^{-5}$ since $z = 1.75$, but in our present analysis we used the well documented sample from Murphy, Webb & Flambaum (2003).

Dynamical gauge couplings can equivalently be expressed as dynamical permeabilities, see e.g. Magueijo, Sandvik & Kibble (2001). Suppose q is a particular fixed value for the dynamical gauge coupling $Q(x)$ (q will be further specified below). With the transformation $qA_\mu(x) = Q(x)\mathcal{A}_\mu(x)$ the covariant derivatives can be written in terms of a variable or a constant gauge coupling

$$D_\mu(x) = \partial_\mu - \mathrm{i}Q(x)\mathcal{A}_\mu(x) = \partial_\mu - \mathrm{i}qA_\mu(x),$$

but in the theory with the manifestly variable gauge coupling $Q(x)$ the field strength tensor is

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\mathrm{i}}{Q}[D_\mu, D_\nu] = \frac{1}{Q}\partial_\mu(Q\mathcal{A}_\nu) - \frac{1}{Q}\partial_\nu(Q\mathcal{A}_\mu)$$

while the field strength tensor with the constant coupling has the standard form $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu = (Q/q)\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}$. As a consequence the gauge theory with variable coupling and constant permeability appears as a gauge theory with constant coupling and variable permeability:

$$-\frac{1}{4\mu_0}\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}(x)\mathcal{F}^{\mu\nu}(x) = -\frac{q^2}{4\mu_0 Q^2(x)}F_{\mu\nu}(x)F^{\mu\nu}(x).$$

The dynamical coupling constant for charge Ze and the dynamical permeability in SI units are

$$Q(x) = Ze(x)/\hbar = 2Z\sqrt{\pi\epsilon_0 c\alpha(x)/\hbar}$$

---

[1] We follow the standard sign convention $\Delta\alpha \equiv \alpha_z - \alpha_0$, such that $\Delta\alpha < 0$ corresponds to an increase of α with time.

and

$$\mu(x) = \mu_0\alpha(x)/\alpha_0 = \frac{4\pi\hbar}{ce_0^2}\alpha(x),$$

respectively. In the sequel we use units with $\hbar = c = 1$.

The scalar variable $Q(x)$ may not have a canonically normalized kinetic term. Therefore a transformation $Q(x) = Q(\phi(x))$ may be required if we want in leading order a standard $(\partial\phi)^2$ term for the dynamics of Q:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{q^2}{4Q^2(\phi)}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi - V(\phi). \qquad (2)$$

Here we assume that the potential $V(\phi)$ has a unique minimum $V(\phi_0)$ at some value $\phi = \phi_0$, and we parametrize the scalar field ϕ such that $\phi_0 = 0$. Furthermore, any nonvanishing term $V(0)$ would contribute to the cosmological constant and will not be considered as part of the energy density ϱ_ϕ stored in the scalar field ϕ. The leading order expansion of the potential is then

$$V(\phi) \simeq \frac{1}{2}m^2\phi^2, \quad m^2 = \left.\frac{d^2V(\phi)}{d\phi^2}\right|_{\phi=0}. \qquad (3)$$

With this proviso it seems prudent to choose $q = Q(0)$ as the equilibrium value to which the gauge coupling should evolve due to the presence of the Hubble term $3H\dot{\phi}$. In leading order this implies the following parametrization for the coupling function $Q(\phi)$:

$$Q^2(\phi) \simeq q^2\left(1 - \frac{\phi}{f}\right), \qquad (4)$$

with the coupling scale defined accordingly

$$\frac{1}{f} \equiv -\frac{1}{q^2}\left.\frac{dQ^2(\phi)}{d\phi}\right|_{\phi=0}. \qquad (5)$$

Besides the convention $\phi_0 = 0$ for the equilibrium position this also implies a sign convention on the field ϕ if we require $f > 0$: ϕ is chosen as positive if it reduces the fine structure constant in first order (see also e.g. Damour & Nordtvedt (1993)), and the observations of Murphy et al. then indicate that ϕ is decaying from a positive value towards its equilibrium value $\phi_0 = 0$.

Examples of specific coupling functions are provided e.g. by string theory or Kaluza–Klein theories:

$$Q^2(\phi) = q^2\exp(-\phi/f), \qquad (6)$$

and the Coulomb problem in these theories exhibits an ultraviolet regularization at a scale[2] $r_f = q/(8\pi f)$ (Dick 1997b).

For the present investigation we will not specify the coupling function $Q(\phi)$ any further but only use the linear expansion (4).

Landau & Vucetich (2002) reconsidered the original Bekenstein model and concluded that it would not comply with the observations of Murphy et al. In a very interesting extension Olive & Pospelov (2002) investigated a model where the dynamics of a massless scalar field ϕ is mostly driven by its couplings to dark matter and the cosmological constant, and they analyzed compatibility of (1) with various constraints on variations of α. Our coupling parameter f is related to the parameters M_*, ζ_F and ω in Olive & Pospelov (2002) through $f = M_*/\zeta_F = \sqrt{2\omega}M_{Pl}/\zeta_F = 4\sqrt{\pi\omega}m_{Pl}/\zeta_F$, and their results favor $f > 10^3 M_{Pl}$, corresponding to a subgravitational coupling strength of ϕ to photons.

Gardner (2003) has recently discussed the implications of a mass term on the evolution of the fine-structure constant, and reported it to be consistent with mass values for the scalar field ϕ around $m \simeq H_0 \simeq 10^{-33}\,\mathrm{eV}$. Three crucial assumptions in Gardner's work are that the contribution of ϕ to the dark matter density is negligible, that $f \leqslant m_{Pl}$, and that $0 < |\zeta_m|m_{Pl}^2/f^2 < 10^{-5}$, where ζ_m is the coupling of ϕ to matter. A low mass value $m \sim H_0$ was also preferred in the recent work by Anchordoqui & Goldberg (2003), who identified ϕ with the quintessence field, and contrary to Gardner also assumed $f > 10^3 M_{Pl}$ in accordance with Olive & Pospelov (2002). Copeland, Nunes & Pospelov (2003) also identified ϕ with the quintessence and concluded that $f \sim 10^5 m_{Pl}$ to fit the QSO data. However, this result did not comply with the Oklo constraint, and Copeland et al. proposed that a photon momentum dependence of f around $10\,\mathrm{MeV}$ may suppress the effects of dynamical α in nuclear reactions.

In the present paper we propose yet another analysis of the implications of the results of Murphy et al. for a dynamical fine structure constant. In particular we assume $m > 10^{-28}\,\mathrm{eV}$ for the mass of the scalar field ϕ generating the evolution of α. Under this assumption a very weakly coupled field behaves like pressureless dust ever since dust domination, even though it may not satisfy the usual thermal dust condition[3] $m \gg T$. The virtue of $m > 10^{-28}\,\mathrm{eV}$ for our present analysis is that under this condition we can use the late time behavior of $\phi(t)$ for $t \gg m^{-1}$ to characterize the evolution of ϕ ever since radiation–dust equality. Furthermore, our ignorance about evolution of ϕ during radiation domination can be collected in a single parameter[4] $\xi = (\varrho_\phi/\varrho_m)^{1/2}$, and we perform a least squares fit of the time evolution of α in our model to the α_z values reported by Murphy, Webb & Flambaum (2003).

This explores a completely different mass range than Gardner (2003). For $mt \gg 1$ the mass term generates temporal and spatial fluctuations of ϕ at scales m^{-1}, but the Hubble expansion damps these oscillations $\propto t^{-1}$, such that the amplitude of these oscillations is well below current observational limits from laboratory based search experiments for variable α. Furthermore, with $mt \gg 1$ we will be able to use a virial theorem to eliminate m from the long term variation of ϕ. The fit of the long term behavior of $\alpha(t)$ derived in Sec. 2 to the data of Murphy et al. then allows us to estimate the parameter f/ξ.

---

[2] Subsequently the abelian and non-abelian Coulomb problem was also found to be exactly solvable for other functions $Q(\phi)$ (Dick 1999; Chabab, Markazi & Saidi 2000; Slusarczyk & Wereszczynski 2001,2003), and with mass couplings of ϕ (Dick 1997d; Bekenstein 2002).

[3] This general result that non-thermal coherent oscillations behave like cold dark matter was observed for the first time in axion physics (Abbott & Sikivie 1983; Dine & Fischler 1983; Preskill, Wise & Wilczek 1983).

[4] $\xi \simeq 1$ would imply that ϕ is a dominant cold dark matter component. This possibility was pointed out for heavy dilatons ($m \gg T$, dilaton WIMPs) by Gasperini & Veneziano (1994) and by Damour & Vilenkin (1996), and for oscillations of light dilatons ($T \geqslant m \gg t^{-1}$) by Dick (1997a).

For cosmological parameters we rely on the recent evaluation from the Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) and the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) (Spergel et al. 2003; Tegmark et al. 2003). We use in particular the values from the "vanilla lite" model (Tegmark et al. 2003):

$$\Omega_\Lambda = 0.707^{+0.031}_{-0.039}, \quad h = 0.708^{+0.023}_{-0.024}, \tag{7}$$

$$t_0 = 13.40^{+0.13}_{-0.12}\,\mathrm{Gyr}.$$

We included the errors given by Tegmark et al. (2003) for illustration, but do not use them for error propagation. They are negligible compared to the uncertainties in the α values for the QSO absorption systems, which generate a 1σ uncertainty of about 22%, see Eq. (20) below.

The dependence of the WMAP CMB results on α is relatively weak in that it complies with $0.95 < \alpha_{dec}/\alpha_0 < 1.02$ (Rocha et al. 2003). The dynamical evolution of α calculated below implies that at the time of decoupling $0 > (\alpha_{dec} - \alpha)/\alpha > -1 \times 10^{-4}$, such that at this stage we can safely use WMAP results on cosmological parameters for the determination of f/ξ.

Sec. 2 recalls the relevant features of the dynamical evolution of a scalar field in an expanding universe and includes a virial theorem that will be useful in the analysis of dynamical gauge couplings.

Our main result in Sec. 3 is an equation for the evolution of $\alpha(t)$ from the ϕ-γ coupling, and the fit to the results of Murphy et al. in Sec. 4 yields f/ξ. In Sec. 5 we will compare the time evolution of α in our model with the Oklo and meteorite constraints, and Sec. 6 contains our conclusions.

2 THE COSMOLOGICAL EVOLUTION OF ϕ

With $mt \gg 1$ the mass parameter induces spatial and temporal fluctuations of ϕ, and therefore of α. One might hope to use this to determine m from a Fourier decomposition of observations of α over cosmological distances. Our primary interest here is the coupling scale f of the scalar field to photons, and the strategy is to use a fit of the long term evolution of ϕ in the expanding universe to the time variation of α reported by Murphy et al. At this stage this allows us to infer a value for f/ξ.

ϕ is usually assumed to have at most extremely weak matter couplings, and the long term evolution of very weakly coupled helicity states follows

$$\ddot\phi(t) + 3H(t)\dot\phi(t) + m^2\phi(t) = 0, \tag{8}$$

with a corresponding evolution of the comoving energy density $\sqrt{-g}\varrho_\phi = a^3(\dot\phi^2 + m^2\phi^2)/2$

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_0\left(a^3\dot\phi^2 + a^3m^2\phi^2\right) = \frac{3}{2}Ha^3\left(m^2\phi^2 - \dot\phi^2\right). \tag{9}$$

Note that in Eq. (8) we used the convention $\phi_0 = 0$, cf. (3).

The solution of Eq. (8) for $m = 0$,

$$\partial_0\phi(t) \propto a^{-3}(t)$$

implies $\varrho_\phi(t) \propto a^{-6}(t)$, as appropriate for the ultrahard fluid component generated by massless weakly coupled helicity states (see e.g. Dick (2001)).

The solution of Eq. (8) for $m > 0$ and $a \sim t^{2/3}$

$$\phi(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\left(AJ_{\frac{1}{2}}(mt) + BY_{\frac{1}{2}}(mt)\right)$$

has asymptotics for $mt \gg 1$:

$$\phi(t) \propto \frac{1}{t}\cos(mt + \varphi),$$

$$\varrho_\phi \propto t^{-2} \propto a^{-3}. \tag{10}$$

This means that at late times $p_\phi \simeq 0$ since

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\varrho_\phi a^3\right) \simeq 0,$$

just as for thermalized non-relativistic matter, but here even for $m \leqslant T$.

Eq. (8) can be used to express the difference of the comoving kinetic and potential energy densities as a time derivative

$$2a^3\mathcal{H}_{kin} - 2a^3\mathcal{H}_{pot} = a^3\dot\phi^2 - m^2a^3\phi^2 = \frac{d}{dt}(a^3\phi\dot\phi). \tag{11}$$

This implies for the time limit

$$\overline{\mathcal{H}} = \lim_{\tau\to\infty}\frac{1}{\tau}\int_0^\tau dt\,\mathcal{H}(t)$$

a virial theorem

$$\overline{a^3\mathcal{H}_{kin}} = \overline{a^3\mathcal{H}_{pot}},$$

$$\overline{a^3\varrho_\phi} \equiv \overline{a^3\mathcal{H}} = m^2\overline{a^3\phi^2} = \overline{a^3\dot\phi^2}. \tag{12}$$

However, note that at late times $a^3\phi\dot\phi \propto t^0$, and therefore Eq. (11) also yields

$$\mathcal{H}_{kin} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{pot}, \tag{13}$$

i.e.

$$|\dot\phi| \simeq m|\phi|, \tag{14}$$

$$\varrho_\phi \simeq \dot\phi^2. \tag{15}$$

This relation can be used to trade the mass dependent $|\dot\phi|$ for the energy density ϱ_ϕ in the late time evolution ($t \gg m^{-1}$) of α.

3 THE COSMOLOGICAL EVOLUTION OF α

From Eq. (4) we have with $\alpha \equiv \alpha_0 \equiv \alpha(t_0)$:

$$\frac{\alpha(t)}{\alpha} = \frac{e^2(\phi(t))}{e^2} \simeq 1 - \frac{\phi}{f},$$

and with (15)

$$\frac{|\dot\alpha(t)|}{\alpha} \simeq \frac{|\dot\phi|}{f} \simeq \frac{\sqrt{\varrho_\phi}}{f}. \tag{16}$$

We know from Eq. (10) and Eq. (A5) in the Appendix that

$$\varrho_\phi(t) = \varrho_{\phi,0}\left(\frac{a_0}{a(t)}\right)^3 = \frac{\varrho_{\phi,0}}{\varrho_{m,0}}\varrho_m(t) = \frac{\varrho_{\phi,0}}{\varrho_{m,0}}\frac{\Lambda}{\sinh^2(t/\tau)}.$$

We denote the contribution from the dynamical gauge coupling to the matter density by $\xi^2 = \varrho_{\phi,0}/\varrho_{m,0}$, and find for the rate of change of the fine structure constant

$$\frac{|\dot\alpha(t)|}{\alpha} \simeq \frac{\xi}{f}\frac{\sqrt{\Lambda}}{\sinh(t/\tau)}. \tag{17}$$

Integration yields

$$\ln\left(\frac{\alpha(t)}{\alpha(t_0)}\right) = \xi\frac{2m_{Pl}}{\sqrt{3}f}\ln\left(\frac{\tanh(t/2\tau)}{\tanh(t_0/2\tau)}\right). \tag{18}$$

The time constant is with $\Lambda = 0.707\varrho_c$

$$\tau = \frac{2m_{Pl}}{\sqrt{3\Lambda}} = 5.250\times10^{32}\,\mathrm{eV}^{-1} = 3.455\times10^{17}\,\mathrm{s} = 10.95\,\mathrm{Gyr}.$$

To match Eq. (18) to the data from Murphy, Webb & Flambaum (2003) we also need the redshift-time relation for $z \ll 10^3$ from (A4)

$$\begin{aligned} t_z &= \tau\sinh^{-1}\left(\frac{\sinh(t_0/\tau)}{(1+z)^{1.5}}\right) \qquad (19)\\ &= 10.95\times\sinh^{-1}\left(\frac{1.553}{(1+z)^{1.5}}\right)\,\mathrm{Gyr}. \end{aligned}$$

Eqs. (18) and (19) allow for a determination of the parameter f/ξ.

4 THE COUPLING SCALE

The parameter f/ξ was determined from a fit of the Eqs. (18,19) to the $\alpha(z)$ values reported by Murphy, Webb & Flambaum (2003). We set

$$y_i = \ln\left(\frac{\alpha(t_i)}{\alpha(t_0)}\right),$$

$$x_i = \ln\left(\frac{\tanh(t_i/2\tau)}{\tanh(t_0/2\tau)}\right),$$

and the minimal variance

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i\left(\frac{y_i - sx_i}{\delta y_i}\right)^2$$

in the fit of (18) occurs for a slope

$$s = \xi\frac{2m_{Pl}}{\sqrt{3}f} = \frac{\sum_i x_i y_i/\delta y_i^2}{\sum_j x_j^2/\delta y_j^2}$$

with variance

$$\sigma_s^2 = \sum_i \delta y_i^2\,(\partial s/\partial y_i)^2 = \left(\sum_i x_i^2/\delta y_i^2\right)^{-1}.$$

The errors in $\ln(\alpha_z/\alpha_0)$ are related to the errors in $\Delta\alpha/\alpha_0$ through

$$\delta y_i = \frac{\delta\Delta\alpha}{\alpha_0+\Delta\alpha}.$$

This method yields a slope

$$s = (5.443\pm1.174)\times10^{-6} \tag{20}$$

corresponding to a coupling parameter

$$\frac{f}{\xi} = 2.12^{+0.58}_{-0.37}\times10^5 m_{Pl}. \tag{21}$$

The variance per degree of freedom is $\chi^2_{dof} = 1.067$.

The resulting asymptotic equilibrium value of the fine structure constant is

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\alpha(t)/\alpha(t_0) = \tanh(t_0/2\tau)^{-s} \simeq 1 + (3.3\pm0.7)\times10^{-6}.$$

The current rate of change of α from Eqs. (18,20)

$$\frac{\dot\alpha}{\alpha} = \frac{s}{4\tau\sinh(t_0/\tau)} = (4.0\pm0.9)\times10^{-17}\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1} \tag{22}$$

is within the bounds from current atomic clock experiments (Marion et al. 2003):

$$-2.0\times10^{-16}\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1} \leqslant \frac{\dot\alpha}{\alpha} \leqslant 1.2\times10^{-16}\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1}.$$

5 COMPARISON WITH THE OKLO AND METEORITE CONSTRAINTS

With the cosmological parameters (7) and Eq. (19) the closest QSO absorption system used in Murphy, Webb & Flambaum (2003) corresponds to a distance of about 2.7 billion light years. A well known more recent constraint on variations of α over cosmological time scales comes from isotope abundances in the natural Oklo reactor, which had been active about 1.8 billion years ago (Shlyakhter 1976; Damour & Dyson 1996; Fujii 2003).

The recent evaluation by Fujii (2003) yields a bound

$$\frac{\alpha_{Oklo}-\alpha}{\alpha} = -(0.8\pm1.0)\times10^{-8}, \tag{23}$$

whereas insertion of (21) into (18) yields

$$\frac{\alpha_{Oklo}-\alpha}{\alpha} = -(6.38^{+1.37}_{-1.38})\times10^{-7}.$$

The situation appears to be different with the ^{187}Re constraints, which limit the evolution of α over the last 4.6 Gyr (Peebles & Dicke 1962; Dyson 1972; Olive et al. 2003): The most recent constraint from Olive et al. (2003) is

$$\frac{\alpha_{4.6}-\alpha}{\alpha} = -(0.8\pm0.8)\times10^{-6},$$

while Eqs. (21,18) yield

$$\frac{\alpha_{4.6}-\alpha}{\alpha} = -(1.95\pm0.42)\times10^{-6}.$$

Olive & Pospelov (2002) and Gardner (2003) could fit their externally driven models for the evolution of α to both the QSO data and the Oklo constraint, whereas Anchordoqui & Goldberg (2003), Copeland, Nunes & Pospelov (2003) and we find a lower value of α. However, Mota & Barrow (2003) have recently pointed out that the local variation of α in virialized overdensities like our own can relax the Oklo constraint by a factor 10-100, because on the one hand a dynamical α would be expected to have a higher value in overdensities, while on the other hand virialization of overdensities slows down the evolution of α. The qualitative picture emerging from this is that in overdensities α evolves from a higher initial value after virialization, but at slower pace, whence it approaches again the value in the low-density background universe. This can explain discrepancies between astrophysical and geochemical observations.

6 CONCLUSIONS

We have found the equation (18) for the dynamical time evolution of α due to the coupling $-(\phi/4f)F^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}$ of electromagnetic fields to a very weakly coupled massive scalar field with $mt \gg 1$. A fit of this equation to the quasar absorption data reported by Murphy, Webb & Flambaum (2003) yields the value (21), where $\xi = \sqrt{\varrho_{\phi,0}/\varrho_{m,0}}$ parametrizes the contribution of the scalar field ϕ to the matter density.

Within this model the evolution of α reported by Murphy et al. appears to be slow due to a small coefficient $s = (5.443 \pm 1.174) \times 10^{-6}$ in Eq. (18): The fine-structure constant varied so little since $z = 3.66$ because the ϕ abundance is small and the ϕ-γ coupling is very weak and presumably of subgravitational strength, in agreement with the analyses of Olive & Pospelov (2002); Anchordoqui & Goldberg (2003) and Copeland, Nunes & Pospelov (2003).

Our coherent oscillation model for dynamical α (and other self-driven models of dynamical α (Anchordoqui & Goldberg 2003; Copeland, Nunes & Pospelov 2003)) still seems to predict a too small value of α at the time when the Oklo natural reactor was active. However, as Mota & Barrow (2003) have pointed out, at low redshift predictions of faster evolution of α from astrophysical observations are to be expected due to spatial variations in the presence of local overdensities. Note that this does not affect the numerical results (20,21,22) (or the corresponding results of Anchordoqui & Goldberg (2003) and Copeland, Nunes & Pospelov (2003)), since the resulting discrepancy of α_0 on Earth and far away from virialized objects is smaller than the number of significant figures reported[5].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported through the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

REFERENCES

Abbott L. F., Sikivie P., 1983, Phys. Lett. B, 120, 133

Anchordoqui L., Goldberg H., 2003, Phys. Rev. D, 68, 083513

Bekenstein J. D., 1982, Phys. Rev. D, 25, 1527

Bekenstein J. D., 2002, Phys. Rev. D, 66, 123514

Chabab M., Markazi R., Saidi E. H., 2000, Eur. Phys. J. C, 13, 543

Copeland E. J., Nunes N. J., Pospelov M., 2003, *Models of quintessence coupled to the electromagnetic field and the cosmological evolution of alpha*, hep-ph/0307299

Damour T., Dyson F., 1996, Nucl. Phys. B, 480, 37

Damour T., Nordtvedt K., 1993, Phys. Rev. D, 48, 3436

Damour T., Vilenkin A., 1996, Phys. Rev. D, 53, 2981

Dick R., 1997a, Mod. Phys. Lett. A, 12, 47; in Klapdor-Kleingrothaus H. V., Ramachers Y., eds, Dark Matter in Astro- and Particle Physics, World Scientific, Singapore, p. 395

Dick R., 1997b, Phys. Lett. B, 397, 193

Dick R., 1997c, Fortschr. Phys., 45, 537

Dick R., 1997d, Phys. Lett. B, 409, 321

Dick R., 1999, Eur. Phys. J. C, 6, 701

Dick R., 2001, Phys. Lett. B, 510, 10

Dine M., Fischler W., 1983, Phys. Lett. B, 120, 137

Dyson F., 1972, in Salam A., Wigner E. P., eds, Aspects of Quantum Theory, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. 213

Fierz M., 1956, Helv. Phys. Acta, 29, 128

Fujii Y., 2003, *Oklo constraint on the time-variability of the fine-structure constant*, hep-ph/0311026

Gardner C. L., 2003, Phys. Rev. D, 68, 043513

Gasperini M., Veneziano G., 1994, Phys. Rev. D, 50, 2519

Jordan P., 1959, Z. Phys., 157, 112

Landau S. J., Vucetich H., 2002, ApJ, 570, 463

Magueijo J., Sandvik H., Kibble T. W. B., 2001, Phys. Rev. D, 64, 023521

Marion H., Pereira Dos Santos F., Abgrall M., Zhang S., Sortais Y., Bize S., Maksimovic I., Calonico D., Grünert J., Mandache C., Lemonde P., Santarelli G., Laurent Ph., Clairon A., 2003, Phys. Rev. Lett., 90, 150801

Mota D. F., Barrow J. D., 2003, *Varying α in a more realistic universe*, astro-ph/0306047, Phys. Lett. B in print; *Local and global variations of the fine structure constant*, astro-ph/0309273, MNRAS in print

Murphy M. T., Webb J. K., Flambaum V. V., Dzuba V. A., Churchill C. W., Prochaska J. X., Barrow J. D., Wolfe A. M., 2001, MNRAS, 327, 1208

Murphy M. T., Webb J. K., Flambaum V. V., 2003, MNRAS, 345, 609

Murphy M. T., Flambaum V. V., Webb J. K., Dzuba V. A., Prochaska J. X., Wolfe A. M., 2003, *Constraining variations in the fine-structure constant, quark masses and the strong interactions*, astro-ph/0310318

Olive K. A., Pospelov M., 2002, Phys. Rev. D, 65, 085044

Olive K. A., Pospelov M., Qian Y.-Z., Manhès G., Vangioni-Flam E., Coc A., Cassé M., 2003, *A reexamination of the ^{187}Re bound on the variation of fundamental couplings*, astro-ph/0309252

Peebles P. J., Dicke R. H., 1962, Phys. Rev., 128, 2006

Preskill J., Wise M. B., Wilczek F., 1983, Phys. Lett. B, 120, 127

Rocha G., Trotta R., Martins C. J. A. P., Melchiorri A., Avelino P. P., Viana P. T. P., 2003, *Measuring α in the early universe: CMB polarization, reionization and the Fisher matrix analysis*, astro-ph/0309211, submitted to MNRAS

Shlyakhter A. I., 1976, Nature, 264, 340

Slusarczyk M., Wereszczynski A., 2001, Acta Phys. Pol. B, 32, 2911; 2003, Eur. Phys. J. C, 28, 151

Spergel D. N., Verde L., Peiris H. V., Komatsu E., Nolta M. R., Bennett C. L., Halpern M., Hinshaw G., Jarosik N., Kogut A., Limon M., Meyer S. S., Page L., Tucker G. S., Weiland J. L., Wollack E., Wright E. L., 2003, ApJS, 148, 175

Tegmark M. et al. (SDSS Collaboration), 2003, *Cosmological parameters from SDSS and WMAP*, astro-ph/0310723

Webb J. K., Flambaum V. V., Churchill C. W., Drinkwater M. J., Barrow J. D., 1999, Phys. Rev. Lett., 82, 884

Webb J. K., Murphy M. T., Flambaum V. V., Dzuba V. A., Barrow J. D., Churchill C. W., Prochaska J. X., Wolfe

---

[5] We should emphasize that the spatial variation effect discussed by Mota & Barrow (2003) cannot be used as an argument against the models of Olive & Pospelov (2002) and Gardner (2003), since externally driven models also rather tend to predict a smaller α than the value inferred from the Oklo data. Externally driven models only seem to provide more leeway to fit time evolutions of α.

A. M., 2001, Phys. Rev. Lett., 87, 091301

APPENDIX A: THE SCALE FACTOR IN THE ΛCDM UNIVERSE

The evolution of the scale factor in a spatially flat ΛCDM universe follows from direct integration of the corresponding Friedmann equation

$$\frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} = \frac{\varrho_m + \Lambda}{3m_{Pl}^2} \tag{A1}$$

after insertion of

$$\varrho_m(t) = \varrho_{m,0}\left(\frac{a_0}{a(t)}\right)^3.$$

Integration from t_0 to t yields

$$\frac{\sqrt{3\Lambda}}{2m_{Pl}}(t-t_0) = \ln\left(\frac{\sqrt{\Lambda a^3} + \sqrt{\Lambda a^3 + \varrho_{m,0}a_0^3}}{\sqrt{\Lambda a_0^3} + \sqrt{(\Lambda + \varrho_{m,0})a_0^3}}\right).$$

Solving for the scale factor yields

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)^{3/2} &= \exp\left(\frac{t-t_0}{\tau}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\varrho_{m,0}}{\Lambda + \sqrt{\Lambda^2 + \Lambda\varrho_{m,0}}}\sinh\left(\frac{t-t_0}{\tau}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

with the time constant

$$\tau = \frac{2m_{Pl}}{\sqrt{3\Lambda}}. \tag{A3}$$

We can simplify our result (A2) because the highest redshift $z = 3.66$ used in the analysis still corresponds to an age $t(z) \simeq 1.7\,\mathrm{Gyr} \gg t_{eq}$ much larger than the time $t_{eq} \simeq 1.3 \times 10^5\,\mathrm{yr}$ of matter radiation equality. At times $\gg t_{eq}$ the modification of the time evolution of the scale factor during the very early radiation dominated era can be neglected, and one can integrate Eq. (A1) from $t_1 = 0$ and still get an extremely good approximation for $t \gg t_{eq}$. This yields

$$\frac{a}{a_0} = \left(\frac{\sinh(t/\tau)}{\sinh(t_0/\tau)}\right)^{2/3} \tag{A4}$$

and

$$\varrho_m = \frac{\Lambda}{\sinh^2(t/\tau)}. \tag{A5}$$

This paper has been typeset from a TEX/ LATEX file prepared by the author.